arXiv:1205.6436v2 [cond-mat.str-el] 2 Aug 2012

Spin-Orbital Separation in a Solvable Kugel-Khomskii Problem in One-Dimension

Brijesh Kumar*
School of Physical Sciences, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi 110067, India

(Dated: March 5, 2013)

A Kugel-Khomskii model of spin-1/2 spins and pseudospin-1/2 orbitals with nearest-neighbor interaction is rigorously shown to exhibit spin-orbital separation by means of a non-local unitary transformation. This transformation completely decouples the spins from the orbitals in such a way that the spins become paramagnetic while the orbitals form the solvable XXZ Heisenberg chain. The nature of various correlations is discussed. The significance of this model problem, in relation to the recently observed spin-orbital separation in Sr_2CuO_3, is noted. The spin-orbital separation for the orbital pseudospins greater than 1/2 is also discussed briefly.

PACS numbers: 75.10.Pq , 75.10.Jm, 75.30.Et, 71.70.Ej

Introduction. The multi-orbital Mott-Hubbard insulators are known to exhibit a rich variety of orbito-magnetic order due to the coupled nature of spin and orbital degrees of freedom. The theoretical framework that one uses to discuss such problems goes by the name of Kugel-Khomskii models. These are a natural extension of the Heisenberg spin-exchange to orbitally degenerate cases where the spins and the orbitals get coupled via superexchange to form the spin-orbital models [1]. The phonons, through Jahn-Teller coupling, also participate in the systems with orbital degeneracy. However, at the very least, one simply focuses on the electronic part, the leading term in energy, that gives rise to the Kugel-Khomskii models within second order perturbation theory in the limit of strong local repulsion (for effectively one particle, electron or hole, per unit cell).

There are a lot of materials, such as $KCuF_3$, $LaMnO_3$, MnF_3, Sr_2CuO_3 (to name a few), where the Kugel-Khomskii models are directly applicable [1–3]. For example, in $KCuF_3$, the Cu^{2+} ions, having $[Ar]3d^9$ configuration in the octahedral crystal field of F^- ions, can be treated as having one hole in the twofold degenerate e_g orbitals ($d_{x^2-y^2}$ and d_{z^2}). It is a Mott insulator, and has been studied as a Kugel-Khomskii problem [4, 5]. There are also cases of a different type in which the effective problem looks like a spin-orbital model, although in actual one may not be dealing with degenerate orbitals [6]. For instance, an odd-legged spin-1/2 tube can be described in terms of the effective spin-1/2 and chirality variables. Since chirality can be treated as a pseudospin-1/2 object, an effective model for such a spin-tube is a Kugel-Khmoskii model in one dimension [7–9]. Clearly, there is much interest in studying such spin-orbital models with different motivations.

In this Letter, we present a solvable Kugel-Khomskii model in one dimension (1d), whose most significant feature is the 'spin-orbital separation', an effect similar to the spin-charge separation in the interacting 1d electrons (Luttinger liquids). Interestingly, a recent report of spin-orbital separation in Sr_2CuO_3 [3] makes our (independent) theoretical findings experimentally relevant.

In a Kugel-Khomskii model, the electron spin is described by the Pauli operators $\vec{\sigma}_l$, where l is the site index of a lattice. The operators for the orbitals depend upon the details thereof. Here, we consider twofold degenerate orbitals, in which case the operators in the orbital space can be treated as pseudospin-1/2 objects described by another set of Pauli operators, $\vec{\tau}_l$. For a system of spin-1/2 spins and pseudospin-1/2 orbitals, a typical Kugel-Khomskii problem has the following generic form.

$$\hat{H}_{KK} = \sum_l \left[J_1 \vec{\sigma}_l \cdot \vec{\sigma}_{l+1} + J_2 \left\{ \vec{\tau}_l, \vec{\tau}_{l+1} \right\}_\Delta + J_3 \left(\vec{\sigma}_l \cdot \vec{\sigma}_{l+1} \right) \left\{ \vec{\tau}_l, \vec{\tau}_{l+1} \right\}_{\Delta'} \right] \quad (1)$$

Here, the model Hamiltonian, $\hat{H}_{KK}$, is written on a 1d lattice, and it only has the nearest-neighbor exchange interactions. Of course, in general, the $\hat{H}_{KK}$ could have further neighbor exchanges, and be living on any lattice. The exchange interactions, $J_{\{1,2,3\}}$, are assumed to be antiferromagnetic, unless stated to be otherwise. The symbol $\{\vec{\tau}_l, \vec{\tau}_{l+1}\}_\Delta$ denotes an anisotropic exchange, $\Delta \tau^z_l \tau^z_{l+1} + 2\left(\tau^+_l \tau^-_{l+1} + \tau^+_{l+1}\tau^-_l\right)$, between the orbitals. Evidently, the H_{KK} is SU(2) symmetric for spins, and has U(1) symmetry for orbitals. Therefore, the total spin and the z-component of total pseudospin are conserved. When $\Delta = \Delta' = 1$, it becomes SU(2)×SU(2) symmetric. These are complex models to investigate theoretically, and have attracted a lot of attention.

Of the many cases of $\hat{H}_{KK}$, quite a few are special as they allow for exact analytical solution of some kind. Most notable is the SU(4) symmetric model corresponding to $J_1 = J_2 = J_3$ and $\Delta = \Delta' = 1$ whose ground state energy and elementary excitations are known using Bethe ansatz [10, 11]. There are other interesting cases as well. For example, when $J_1 = J_2 = 3J_3$ for $\Delta = \Delta' = 1$, the exact ground state is doubly degenerate with the spins and the orbitals separately forming pairwise singlets on alternate bonds. The same ground state also holds true for $\Delta = \Delta' = 0$ and $J_1 = 2J_3$ and $J_2 = 3J_3$ [12–14]. The quantum phase diagram for general J_1/J_3 and J_2/J_3 has also been investigated using DMRG [15, 16]. Different variations of $\hat{H}_{KK}$ are also known to give some interesting exactly solvable models. Notable ones are a symmetric XY spin-orbital model which can be completely solved using Jordan-Wigner transformation [17], and an integrable dimerized chain with $J_3 = -2$ and (J_1, J_2) alternately equal to $(\frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ or $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2})$ on successive nearest-neighbor bonds [18]. We too have found a special case which is the subject of our discussion in this Letter.

Model. We present the following spin-orbital Hamiltonian in one dimension. We were led to this special model through an unexpected route starting with the infinite U Hubbard model [19, 20].

$$\hat{H} = \sum_l \left[J_z \tau_l^z \tau_{l+1}^z + J_\perp \hat{X}_{l,l+1} \left(\tau_l^+ \tau_{l+1}^- + \tau_{l+1}^+ \tau_l^- \right) \right] \quad (2)$$

Here, J_z and $J_\perp$ are the nearest-neighbor interaction parameters. While J_z measures the strength of Ising interaction between orbitals, $J_\perp$ couples the spin-exchange, $\hat{X}_{l,l+1} = (1 + \vec{\sigma}_l \cdot \vec{\sigma}_{l+1})/2$, with the orbital quantum fluctuations (the XY part of the orbital-exchange). It corresponds to the $\hat{H}_{KK}$ for $J_1 = \Delta' = 0$, $J_2 = J_3 = J_\perp/4$ and $\Delta = 4J_z/J_\perp$. Evidently, the $\hat{H}$ is SU(2)×U(1) symmetric, and conserves $\sum_l \tau_l^z$ as well as the total spin, $\frac{1}{2}\sum_l \vec{\sigma}_l$. Below we will show that the $\hat{H}$ of Eq. (2) is exactly solvable through a transformation which completely decouples spins from orbitals, such that the decoupled problems (of spins and orbitals) are separately solvable. Recently, there has been some experimental interest in the spin-orbital separation in quasi 1d systems [3]. The model $\hat{H}$ presents a realistic and rigorous theoretical example of the same.

An important property of the spin-exchange operators, $\hat{X}_{l,l+1}$, is that $\hat{X}^2_{l,l+1} = \mathbb{I}$, where $\mathbb{I}$ is the Identity operator. It prompts us to view $\hat{X}_{l,l+1}$ as a unimodular 'operator phase' factor. Since it appears in conjunction with $\tau_l^+\tau_{l+1}^-$ in $\hat{H}$, we are led to think that one may suitably gauge-transform $\tau_l^\pm$ to rid the $\hat{H}$ of $\hat{X}_{l,l+1}$ operators. It turns out that we can indeed achieve this by the procedure invented in Ref. [19] by the present author, for the infinite-U Hubbard model in 1d. Its applicability to the spin-orbital problem was also briefly noted there. The method exploits the identity $\hat{X}^2_{l,l+1} = \mathbb{I}$, and assumes open boundary condition. It enables us to completely decouple the spins from orbitals by applying a suitably defined non-local unitary transformation on $\hat{H}$. The details are as follows.

Consider the $J_\perp$ term in $\hat{H}$ (denoted below as $\hat{H}_\perp$),

$$\hat{H}_\perp = J_\perp \sum_{l=1}^{L-1} (\tau_l^+ \hat{X}_{l,l+1} \tau_{l+1}^- + \tau_{l+1}^+ \hat{X}_{l+1,l} \tau_l^-), \quad (3)$$

where $\hat{X}_{l+1,l} = \hat{X}^\dagger_{l,l+1}$ ($= \hat{X}_{l,l+1}$, as it is Hermitian), and L is the total number of lattice sites. Here, we have explicitly put in the open boundary condition in the lattice summation. Now, define on bond (1,2) a unitary operator, $\mathcal{U}_{1,2} = \hat{P}_2^- + \hat{P}_2^+ \hat{X}_{2,1}$, where $\hat{P}_2^\pm = (1 \pm \tau_2^z)/2$ are the projections operators for the orbitals states on site 2. By applying it on $\hat{H}_\perp$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{U}^\dagger_{1,2} \hat{H}_\perp \mathcal{U}_{1,2} \\ &= J_\perp \Big\{ (\tau_1^+ \tau_2^- + \tau_2^+ \tau_1^-) + (\tau_2^+ \hat{\mathcal{X}}_{2,3} \tau_3^- + \tau_3^+ \hat{\mathcal{X}}_{3,2} \tau_2^-) \\ &\quad + \sum_{l=3}^{L-1} (\tau_l^+ \hat{X}_{l,l+1} \tau_{l+1}^- + \tau_{l+1}^+ \hat{X}_{l+1,l} \tau_l^-) \Big\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

As a result of the transformation under $\mathcal{U}_{1,2}$, three things have happened to $\hat{H}_\perp$. First, the spin-exchange operator $\hat{X}_{1,2}$ has vanished from the bond (1,2). Now we only have $(\tau_1^+\tau_2^- + \tau_2^+\tau_1^-)$. Second, the operator, $\hat{X}_{2,3}$, on bond (2,3) has got transformed into a new operator $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{2,3} = \hat{X}_{1,2}\hat{X}_{2,3}$. Thus, the $\hat{X}_{1,2}$ hasn't quite disappeared from $\hat{H}_\perp$. Instead, it has been transferred to the bond (2,3). Unlike $\hat{X}_{2,3}$, the new operator $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{2,3}$ is not Hermitian. But it is unitary, which is important. Furthermore, we adopt the notation, $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{3,2} = \hat{\mathcal{X}}^\dagger_{2,3}$. Therefore, $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{2,3}\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{3,2} = \hat{\mathcal{X}}_{3,2}\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{2,3} = \mathbb{I}$. And third, the interactions on the bonds beyond the bond (2,3) remain unaffected. These observations suggest that we may similarly transfer $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{2,3}$ to bond (3,4) and so on, and eventually get rid of all the spin-exchange operators in $\hat{H}_\perp$ on an open chain.

The strategy is to eat-up one-by-one the spin-exchange factors on successive bonds. The unitary operator which does this can be defined as: $\mathcal{U} = \prod_{l=1}^{L-1} \mathcal{U}_{l,l+1}$, where

$$\mathcal{U}_{l,l+1} = \hat{P}^-_{l+1} + \hat{P}^+_{l+1} \hat{\mathcal{X}}_{l+1,l}. \quad (5)$$

Here, $\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{l,l+1} = \hat{X}_{1,2}\hat{X}_{2,3}\cdots\hat{X}_{l,l+1}$ is the string of exchange operators, and $\hat{P}^\pm_{l+1} = (1 \pm \tau^z_{l+1})/2$ are the orbital projectors. Clearly, the $\mathcal{U}$ is a highly non-local unitary operator. By transforming under $\mathcal{U}$, we find that

$$\mathcal{U}^\dagger \hat{H}_\perp \mathcal{U} = J_\perp \sum_{l=1}^{L-1} (\tau_l^+ \tau_{l+1}^- + \tau_{l+1}^+ \tau_l^-). \quad (6)$$

This is a remarkable result with two notable features. One, the orbitals have been completely decoupled from the spins, and two, the spin-spin interaction has completely vanished. This is a rigorous demonstration of the spin-orbital separation in a Kugel-Khomskii problem.

The resultant orbital problem in Eq. (6) is an XY chain which is well-known to be exactly solvable, as it can be converted to a free fermion Hamiltonian using Jordan-Wigner transformation [21]. Moreover, the spins form an ideal paramagnet due to the lack of any spin-spin interaction in the transformed problem. This obviously makes $\hat{H}_\perp$ a solved Kugel-Khomskii problem, where one exactly knows all the eigenvalues and eigenstates. Every eigenvalue of $\hat{H}_\perp$ is exponentially degenerate ($\sim 2^L$) due to the free spins. Even the ground state of $\hat{H}_\perp$ has an extensive entropy of $L \log 2$.

We further note that $\mathcal{U}^\dagger \sum_l \sigma_l^z \, \mathcal{U} = \sum_l \sigma_l^z$ and $\mathcal{U}^\dagger \tau_l^z \, \mathcal{U} = \tau_l^z$. Since $\sum_l \sigma_l^z$ and τ_l^z operators are invariant under $\mathcal{U}$, it enables us to write a more general model, solvable through the same spin-orbital decoupling procedure used for $\hat{H}_\perp$ in Eq. (6). A simple and realistic modification that we do to $\hat{H}_\perp$ is to add the nearest-neighbor orbital Ising term, $J_z \sum_l \tau_l^z \tau_{l+1}^z$. This gives us the model $\hat{H}$ of Eq. (2). Clearly, due to the invariance of τ_l^z under $\mathcal{U}$, the $\hat{H}$ also exhibits exact spin-orbital separation. That is,

$$\mathcal{U}^\dagger \hat{H} \, \mathcal{U} = \sum_{l=1}^{L-1} \left[J_z \tau_l^z \tau_{l+1}^z + J_\perp (\tau_l^+ \tau_{l+1}^- + \tau_{l+1}^+ \tau_l^-) \right] , \quad (7)$$

which is the XXZ Heisenberg problem, solvable by Bethe ansatz [22–24]. Thus, the $\hat{H}$ is an exactly solvable Kugel-Khomskii problem. We can add more arbitrary terms of the type, $V_o(\{\tau_l^z\}) + V_s(\sum_l \sigma_l^z, \sum_l \sigma_l^x, \sum_l \sigma_l^y)$, to $\hat{H}$, and still rigorously achieve spin-orbital separation using $\mathcal{U}$. For example, we can certainly add a term like, $-\sum_l (h\sigma_l^z + \eta \tau_l^z)$, where h and η are the fields for spins and orbitals, respectively. However, in general, the resulting problem may not always be analytically solvable.

As a function of J_z (setting $J_\perp = 1$), the exact ground state of $\hat{H}$ behaves as follows. For $|J_z| < 1/2$, the orbital part is critical with power law correlations and gapless excitations, akin to the XY case ($J_z = 0$). For $J_z < -1/2$, the ground state is ferro-orbital and the elementary orbiton excitations are gapped. Similarly, for $J_z > 1/2$, the orbital ground state is Néel ordered with gapped orbital excitations. In all these qualitatively different regions on J_z-line, the spins remain ideally paramagnetic.

At this point, we also like to put our understanding of $\hat{H}_\perp$ in perspective with the results in Ref. [15], where the $\hat{H}_{KK}$ for $\Delta = \Delta' = 0$ has been investigated using DMRG. Particularly for $J_1 = 0$, the point $J_2/J_3 = 1$ (which is $J_2 = 1/4$ in their notation) was identified as a transition point (see Fig. 1 in Ref. [15]), above which the ground state is a direct product of the ferromagnetic spins and the orbital fermi-sea (through Jordan-Wigner mapping), $|F\rangle_s \otimes |JW_{fs}\rangle_o$. Here, F stands for ferromagnetic, JW_{fs} for the Jordan-Wigner fermi-sea, and the subscripts s and o indicate the spin and the orbital subsystems respectively. For $J_2/J_3 \leq 1$, they proposed a spin-dimerized antiferromagnetic (DAF) ground state, $|DAF\rangle_s \otimes |JW_{fs}\rangle_o$. Here, we make an important observation that their transition point $J_2/J_3 = 1$ is same as our $\hat{H}_\perp$. Therefore, $J_2/J_3 = 1$ is in fact a special point in the quantum phase diagram, hitherto unrealized, with exact solvability for the complete eigen-spectrum. The correct ground state at this special point is a highly entropic manifold of 2^L eigenstates, $\mathcal{U}\{|s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_L\rangle \otimes |JW_{fs}\rangle_o\}$, where $|s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_L\rangle$ denotes an Ising configuration of L spin-1/2s, with $s_l =\uparrow$ or $\downarrow$ (for $l = 1$ to L).

Correlations. For the model $\hat{H}$ quite a few different correlation functions can be computed, or understood using the results known for the decoupled problem.

The simplest thing one can compute is the static spin susceptibility, $\chi_s \sim \frac{\beta}{L}\{\langle(\sum_l \sigma_l^z)^2\rangle - \langle \sum_l \sigma_l^z \rangle^2\}$, where $\beta = 1/k_B T$ is the inverse temperature. Consider $\langle \sum_l \sigma_l^z \rangle = Tr\,\{\hat{\rho} \sum_l \sigma_l^z\}$, where $\hat{\rho}$ is the equilibrium thermal density matrix, $e^{-\beta \hat{H}}/Z$, for $\hat{H}$. For the decoupled Hamiltonian, $\mathcal{U}^\dagger \hat{H} \, \mathcal{U}$, the thermal density matrix is $\mathcal{U}^\dagger \hat{\rho} \, \mathcal{U} = \frac{1}{2^L} \mathbb{I} \otimes \hat{\rho}_o$, where $\mathbb{I}$ is the 2^L-dimensional identity matrix for the spin subsystem and $\hat{\rho}_o$ is thermal density matrix for the XXZ orbitals. Since $\sum_l \sigma_l^z$ is invariant under $\mathcal{U}$, the expectation $\langle \sum_l \sigma^z \rangle = \frac{1}{2^L} tr_s\,\{\sum_l \sigma^z\} = 0$, as it ought to be for a paramagnet. Moreover, $\langle (\sum_l \sigma^z)^2 \rangle = L$. Therefore, $\chi_s \sim 1/k_B T$. Here, tr_s denotes the trace over spins only. Similarly, tr_o for the orbitals, and $Tr = tr_s \, tr_o$.

For the orbital pseudospins, the longitudinal susceptibility, $\chi_o \sim \frac{\beta}{L}\{\langle(\sum_l \tau_l^z)^2\rangle - \langle \sum_l \tau_l^z \rangle^2\}$, can also be calculated from the decoupled problem because the τ_l^z operators are invariant under $\mathcal{U}$. The XXZ Heisenberg problem has a very rich mathematical literature from which we can gladly quote the results for χ_o. For the isotropic XXX orbital case, $\chi_o \sim 1 + \frac{1}{2\ln(T_0/T)}$ for small temperatures [25]. For the anisotropic case, with $2J_z/J_\perp > 1$, the orbital excitations are gapped. Therefore, χ_o will exhibit exponential behavior at low temperatures. However, for $2J_z/J_\perp < 1$ when the excitations are gapless, the Bethe ansatz and field-theory treatment has shown that $\chi_o \sim \frac{\theta}{\pi(\pi-\theta)\sin\theta} + cT^\zeta$, at low temperatures. Here, $\theta = \cos^{-1}(2J_z/J_\perp)$, and c is some constant. The exponent $\zeta = \frac{4\theta}{\pi-\theta}$ for $\theta < \frac{\pi}{3}$, and equal to 2 otherwise [25].

Next we discuss the two-point orbital correlation function, $C_o^{zz}(r) = \langle \tau_l^z \tau_{l+r}^z \rangle = Tr\,\left\{\hat{\rho}\tau_l^z \tau_{l+r}^z\right\}$. The invariance of τ_l^z operators under $\mathcal{U}$ implies $C_o^{zz}(r) = tr_o\,\left\{\hat{\rho}_o \tau_l^z \tau_{l+r}^z\right\}$. The zz orbital correlation is thus exactly same as in the corresponding XXZ problem. For example, in the ground state of $\hat{H}_\perp$, it is $C_o^{zz}(r) = -\left[\frac{2}{\pi r}\right]^2$ for odd integer values of r and 0 for even r [21]. For the full problem with non-zero J_z, it has been a terribly hard job to find amicable analytic forms of the correlation functions, but using field theoretic techniques, the asymptotic behavior has been predicted to be $C_o^{zz}(r) \sim (-1)^{|r|}\sqrt{\ln|r|}/|r|$ for the isotropic XXX case. Unlike the zz correlation function, the computation of xx and yy orbital correlations does not simplify because τ_l^x and τ_l^y operators are are not-invariant under $\mathcal{U}$.

The presence of an external magnetic field, $-h\sum_l \sigma^z$, however, simplifies the computation of some ground state correlations by selecting the fully polarized spin state. For $h > 0$, the ground state wavefunction is $|\psi_g\rangle = \mathcal{U}|\uparrow\uparrow \ldots \uparrow\rangle_s \otimes |XXZ\rangle_o = |\uparrow\uparrow \ldots \uparrow\rangle_s \otimes |XXZ\rangle$, where $|\uparrow\uparrow \ldots \uparrow\rangle_s$ and $|XXZ\rangle_o$ denote the fully polarized spin state and the XXZ orbital ground state, respectively. Notably the $\mathcal{U}$ acts like an identity operator on the fully polarized spin state. The spin-spin correlation in this case is trivial, as all the spins are pointing in the same direction. One can also compute the xx and yy orbital correlations in some cases. For example, in the ground state of $\hat{H}_\perp$ (with

$h \neq 0$), $\langle\psi_g|\tau_l^x\tau_{l+r}^x|\psi_g\rangle = \langle\psi_g|\tau_l^y\tau_{l+r}^y|\psi_g\rangle \sim (-1)^{|r|}/\sqrt{|r|}$, as known for the XY model in the limit of large r [26]. Surely, one can quote a lot more results for various calculable objects, as the literature for the XXZ model is vast. But we stop it here, and briefly discuss the applicability of $\hat{H}$, in a suitably adopted form, to $\mathrm{Sr_2CuO_3}$ [3].

Remarks in relation to Sr_2CuO_3. It is a ferro-orbital material with a large energy gap to orbiton excitations (about 2.5 eV from $d_{x^2-y^2}$ to d_{xz}). This can be accounted for by a negative J_z, and a large crystal field, η, that selects the ferro-orbital state. For the antiferromagnetic spins, one may include the nearest-neighbor antiferromagnetic exchange. Thus, a minimal model for $\mathrm{Sr_2CuO_3}$ would be, $\hat{H} + J\sum_l \vec{\sigma}_l \cdot \vec{\sigma}_{l+1} + \eta\sum_l \tau_l^z$, with $J > 0$ and $|J_z|, \eta > J$. The J and $J_\perp$ can be estimated from the spinon continuum width (~ 0.6eV) and the orbiton energies (bandwidth $\sim .2$eV). Although the J term presents a 'formal' difficulty to rigorous spin-orbital separation (because it is not invariant under $\mathcal{U}$), the above model has in it the essential aspects of $\mathrm{Sr_2CuO_3}$, and is worth investigating. [From a mathematical standpoint, one could replace $\sum_l \vec{\sigma}_l \cdot \vec{\sigma}_{l+1}$ by $\left(\sum_l \vec{\sigma}_l\right)^2$, or by $\hat{P}_o^- \sum_l \vec{\sigma}_l \cdot \vec{\sigma}_{l+1} \hat{P}_o^-$ (where $\hat{P}_o^- = \prod_l (1-\tau_l^z)/2$ is a ferro-orbital projector), to rigorously obtain the spin-orbital decoupling under $\mathcal{U}$. The ground states for these three cases would be similar. But obviously the first one is a realistic choice.]

Orbital pseudospin > 1/2. Finally, we discuss the spin-orbital separation in systems with more than two orbitals per site. The idea is to demonstrate that, in principle, this phenomenon can also occur when the orbital pseudospin $> 1/2$. As an example, consider the following generalization of the $\hat{H}$ for an arbitrary orbital pseudospin, T: $\hat{H}_T = \sum_l [J_z \hat{T}_l^z \hat{T}_{l+1}^z + J_\perp \hat{X}_{l,l+1}(\hat{T}_l^{+2T}\hat{T}_{l+1}^{-2T} + h.c.)]$, where $\hat{T}_l^z$ and $\hat{T}_l^\pm$ are the angular momentum operators representing the orbital pseudospin on the l^{th} site, and $\hat{T}_l^{\pm 2T} = (\hat{T}_l^\pm)^{2T}$. We find that $\hat{H}_T$ also exhibits complete spin-orbital decoupling under the unitary transformation, $\mathcal{U}_T = \prod_{l=1}^{L-1} \mathcal{U}_T(l, l+1)$, where $\mathcal{U}_T(l, l+1) = \hat{P}_{l+1}^{-T} + (1 - \hat{P}_{l+1}^{-T})\hat{\mathcal{X}}_{l+1,l}$ is a generalization of Eq. (5). Here, $\hat{P}_l^{-T} = |-T\rangle_l \langle -T|_l$ is the projector for the lowest eigenstate of $\hat{T}_l^z$. We can show that $\mathcal{U}_T^\dagger \hat{H}_T \mathcal{U}_T = \sum_l [J_z \hat{T}_l^z \hat{T}_{l+1}^z + J_\perp(\hat{T}_l^{+2T}\hat{T}_{l+1}^{-2T} + h.c.)]$, similar to the $\hat{H}$. Likewise, it is also valid for the more general forms of $\hat{H}_T$, as $\hat{T}_l^z$ operators and $\sum_l \vec{\sigma}_l$ are invariant under $\mathcal{U}_T$.

Summary. We have found an exactly solvable one-dimensional Kugel-Khomskii model [$\hat{H}$ of Eq. (2)]. It exhibits spin-orbital separation, achieved by a unitary transformation ($\mathcal{U}$) which systematically rids the $\hat{H}$ of the spin-exchange operators. The transformed problem has free spins and the XXZ model for the orbitals. While the obvious symmetry, SU(2)×U(1), of $\hat{H}$ implies the conservation of $\sum_l \vec{\sigma}_l$ and $\sum_l \tau_l^z$ only, in actual, all the spins that vanish from $\hat{H}$ under $\mathcal{U}$ are conserved. Combining this with the integrability of the XXZ chain, one, in principle, has a complete knowledge of all the conserved operators of the $\hat{H}$. This problem is argued to be relevant to the case of $\mathrm{Sr_2CuO_3}$. We have also discussed the spin-orbital separation for the orbital pseudospins $> 1/2$, through a simple generalization of the $\hat{H}$.

---

[*] bkumar@mail.jnu.ac.in

[1] K. I. Kugel and D. I. Khomskii, Sov. Phys. JETP **37**, 725 (1973).
[2] J. C. T. Lee, S. Yuan, S. Lal, Y. I. Joe, Y. Gan, S. Smadici, K. Finkelstein, Y. Feng, A. Rusydi, P. M. Goldbart, S. L. Cooper, and P. Abbamonte, Nat. Phys. **8**, 63 (2012).
[3] J. Schlappa, K. Wohlfeld, K. J. Zhou, M. Mourigal, M. W. Haverkort, V. N. Strocov, L. Hozoi, C. Monney, S. Nishimoto, S. Singh, A. Revcolevschi, J.-S. Caux, L. Patthey, H. M. Rønnow, J. van den Brink, and T. Schmitt, Nature **485**, 82 (2012).
[4] L. F. Feiner, A. M. Olés, and J. Zaanen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 2799 (1997).
[5] M. V. Mostovoy and D. I. Khomskii, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 167201 (2004).
[6] D. Sa and C. Gros, Eur. Phys. J. B **18**, 421 (2000).
[7] V. Subrahmanyam, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 16109 (1994).
[8] A. Lüscher, R. M. Noack, G. Misguich, V. N. Kotov, and F. Mila, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 060405 (2004).
[9] M. Lajkó, P. Sindzingre, and K. Penc, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 017205 (2012).
[10] Y. Yamashita, N. Shibata, and K. Ueda, Phys. Rev. B **58**, 9114 (1998).
[11] B. Sutherland, Phys. Rev. B **12**, 3795 (1975).
[12] A. K. Kolezhuk and H.-J. Mikeska, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2709 (1998).
[13] K. Itoh, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **68**, 322 (1999).
[14] A. K. Kolezhuk, H.-J. Mikeska, and U. Schollwöck, Phys. Rev. B **63**, 064418 (2001).
[15] S. K. Pati and R. R. P. Singh, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 5868 (2000).
[16] S. K. Pati, R. R. P. Singh, and D. I. Khomskii, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5406 (1998).
[17] F. Mila, B. Frischmuth, A. Deppeler, and M. Troyer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 3697 (1999).
[18] M. J. Martins and B. Nienhuis, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 4956 (2000).
[19] B. Kumar, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 155121 (2009).
[20] B. Kumar, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 205115 (2008).
[21] E. H. Lieb, T. D. Schultz, and D. C. Mattis, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **16**, 407 (1961).
[22] B. Sutherland, *Beautiful Models* (World Scientific, 2004).
[23] F. C. Alcaraz, M. N. Barber, M. T. Batchelor, R. J. Baxter, and G. R. W. Quispel, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **20**, 6397 (1987).
[24] H.-J. Mikeska and A. K. Kolezhuk, in *Quantum Magnetism*, Vol. 645, edited by U. Schollwöck, J. Richter, D. J. J. Farnell, and R. F. Bishop (Springer-Verlag, 2004) Chap. 1, pp. 1–83.
[25] S. Eggert, I. Affleck, and M. Takahashi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 332 (1994).
[26] B. M. McCoy, Phys. Rev. **173**, 531 (1968).